

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appln No. 09/113,094
Amit, Dated February 28, 2005
Response to Office Action of January 18, 2005

3

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed Office Action of January 18, 2005. The objections and submissions made by the Examiner in the Office Action have carefully been considered and it is submitted that distinguishing features are present in the invention.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

In this section of the Office Action the Examiner objects to claims 1 to 4 as not complying with 35 USC § 112. In particular, the Examiner alleges that the features defining the second image as being taken “without further user input” and being “substantially identical” to the first image are not disclosed in the specification. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s conclusion on this issue.

It is submitted that disclosure of these features is implicitly included in the last paragraph on page 19, which states:” The operational mode of the camera can be programmed so that upon the depressing of the take photo a first image is sampled by the sensor array to determine relevant parameters. Next a second image is again captured which is utilized for the output. The captured image is then manipulated in accordance with any special requirements before being initially output on the paper roll.” The Applicant draws to the Examiner’s attention the opening statement of the paragraph, underlined in the above citation, which clearly indicates to a skilled addressee that the subsequently mentioned functionalities are programmed within the operational mode of the camera and do not require any further user involvement.

Similarly, the feature that the two images are substantially identical follows as a natural conclusion from the above disclosure. Indeed, using parameters, determined on the basis of the first image, for manipulation of the second image only makes sense if the two images are the same or substantially the same. As a skilled addressee will appreciate, the parameters determined on the basis of the first image will be irrelevant to the second image if the images are substantially different.

Applo No. 09/113,094
Amtdt. Dated February 28, 2005
Response to Office Action of January 18, 2005

4

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In Item 5, the Examiner objects to claims 1, 3 and 4 of the present application as being unpatentable over USPN 5,894,326 (McIntyre et al.) in view of USPN 5,233,414 (Kojima et al.) In Item 6, the Examiner also objects to claim 2 as being unpatentable over USPN 5,894,326 (McIntyre et al.) in view of USPN 5,233,414 (Kojima et al.) and further in view of USPN 6,281,533 (Miyagawa et al.)

The Applicant contests the Examiner's conclusion. However, in the interest of an expeditious prosecution of the application, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to emphasize the fact that the printhead defined in the claim is an inkjet printhead. The amendment is in line with the overall description of the present application (see section "Ink Jet Technologies" on page 20) and merely reflects the preferred embodiment of the invention.

It is submitted that none of the cited prior art documents discloses the features of processing means having "an inkjet printhead for printing out said sensed image" or a method including the step of "printing out said second image by said inkjet printhead", which are explicitly mentioned in the amended claim 1 of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that, claim 1 is novel and inventive in view of the cited documents, when considered separately or in combination. It follows that claims 2 to 4 are also novel and inventive, by virtue of their dependence on claim 1.

In light of the above submission, it is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

Appln No. 09/113,094
Amdt. Dated February 28, 2005
Response to Office Action of January 18, 2005

3

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +612 9555 7762

BEST AVAILABLE COPY